## Approved For Release 2000/08/23 : CIA-RDP62-00680R000100020102-3

Deputy Chief, St/A

3 February 1959

Chief, Geographic Research

Comments on Career Council Agenda

## 1. Mr. Baird's Memorandum on Training Evaluation Reports

- a. It appears to me that Mr. Baird is very right in proposing a discussion of training evaluation reports. My own feeling is that these reports have great potential value in personnel management. The Career Council should attempt to assist the realization of this potential.
- b. Mr. Baird has stated that the reports provide OTR with the data it needs to evaluate its success in fulfilling course objectives. It would also seem clear that the reports benefit the student (though he may not always appreciate them), who needs the evaluation as a tool of stimulus and self appraisal and a means by which he attains a sense of accomplishment and recognition. The supervisor can obtain from the reports a variety of information which may be used in the decisions he must make related to the individual -- enlargement of job, reassignment, promotion, career development, etc.
- c. The problems that have come up with regard to the kind and appropriateness of the reports appear to relate mostly to the training programs that are conducted for the DD/P. However, even the DD/I will, from time to time, have need for differentiation in the kinds of reports made, and it would seem that the Career Council could appropriately provide policy guidance on this also. Personally, I think that par. 5.c. of Mr. Baird's memorandum may identify the best approach. OTR should keep whatever records it feels are necessary to its responsibility. The student should have made available to him a report of accomplishment. The supervisor should receive the kind of report that fits his needs in the particular instance. It should be possible to provide for a choice of the type of evaluation desired at the time the request for training is submitted.

## 2. Notice on Position Analysis as Related to Career Service Average Grade

a. As I understand this, it proposes that positions which are newly established or reclassified because of enlargement or reduction of duties or responsibilities will not be reviewed in detail (e.g., desk audit) except as the average grade of the Career Service concerned should be increased thereby.

## Approved For Release 2000/08/23 : CIA-RDP62-00680R000100020102-3

SUBJECT: Comments on Career Council Agenda

- b. If my understanding is correct, then I think the proposed notice is bad. A principal feature of any new or reclassified position that needs review is the appropriateness, in a management sense, of the action that has been taken. Whether or not the action to reclassify or newly establish a position balances off or can be made to balance off with the previous average grade level and funds allocated to the Career Service concerned is quite secondary.
- c. I think that the Office of Personnel would be vacating its principal responsibility if it did not review each new or reclassified position on its own merits irrespective of arbitrary grade or funds allocations. Whether or not an agreement by OP as to the appropriateness of new or reclassified positions can be implemented within existing appropriations is a management decision which should be made separately.

25X1A9a

Distribution:

O&l -- Addressee

2 -- Ch/G

ORR:Ch/G:RTA/JAB:jmc/535(3 Feb 1959)